RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 0 3 2005

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)
Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional): 2006579-0039 (CTX-072)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on:

on October 3, 2005

Signature: Ruth Dolan

Typed or printed name: Ruth Dolan

Application Number	Filed
09/866,520	May 25, 2001

First Named Inventor: Coleman, et al.

Art Unit	Examiner
2171	David Wiley

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).
Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

- [ ] applicant/inventor.
- [ ] assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)
- [ ] attorney or agent of record. Registration number _____
- [x] attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34: 40,060

Signature

John D. Lanza
Typed or printed name

617-248-4801
Telephone number

October 3, 2005
Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

- [ ] *Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 03 2005

EXPEDITED PROCESSING
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 1.116

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 2006579-0039 (CTX-072)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Coleman, *et al.*	Examiner:	David Wiley
Serial No.:	09/866,520	Art Unit:	2171
Filing Date:	May 25, 2001		
Title:	Reducing the Amount of Graphical Line Data Transmitted Via a Low Bandwidth Transport Protocol Mechanism		

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Certificate of Transmission
I certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on:

October 3, 2005
Date

Ruth Dolan
Signature

RUTH DOLAN
Typed or Printed Name of person signing certificate

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REASONS FOR REQUESTING REVIEW

The following Reasons are submitted with the "PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW" form PTO/SB/33 and A NOTICE OF APPEAL in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31.

In an Office Action dated June 1, 2005, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1-2, 5-8, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,603,470 to Deering (hereafter "Deering"). Applicants respectfully submit that the this rejection contains clear error because at least one claim limitation is not taught by Deering.

In the Response to the Non-Final Office Action filed by Applicants on March 14, 2005 at pages 6-7, applicants provided a clear and concise explanation as to why Deering fails to anticipate claims 1-2, 5-8, and 11-12.

In addition to the arguments previously presented, applicants provide the following arguments in support of the position the Deering fails to anticipate claims 1-2, 5-8, and 11-12. The present invention enables a server to control an off-screen surface of a particular size or type to be formed within the client's memory. The off-screen surface is used to update the client's

PAGE 5/9 * RCVD AT 10/3/2005 7:30:29 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:16177422041 * DURATION (mm-ss):09-18

on-screen surface. See present application, paragraphs 17 and 18. A coordinate system corresponding to the client's display surface is used to define a strip that is to be displayed at the client. In other words, a beginning and an endpoint coordinate of a strip is based on the coordinate system corresponding to the client's display surface. Furthermore, because the coordinate system corresponds to the client's display surface, the coordinate system must only be a two-dimensional coordinate system.

In Deering, the coordinate system is based on a predetermined sphere. See Deering Abstract. The center of the sphere is the origin of a set of x-y-z axes. Vectors and points are represented using this three-dimensional coordinate system. Deering does not teach or suggest that the coordinate system based on the predetermined sphere corresponds to a display surface associated with a client. Additionally, it does not make sense for a three-dimensional coordinate system to correspond to a display surface associated with a client, since the display surface is only two-dimensional. In general, Deering is about how to compress surface normals in three-dimensional graphical data. There is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Deering to have a two-dimensional coordinate system that corresponds to a display surface associated with a client, because such modification would render the system and method taught by Deering inoperable. In other words, compression of surface normals in three-dimensional graphical data using only a two-dimensional coordinate system is not possible.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Deering does not teach or suggest the limitation of a coordinate system corresponding to a region of a display surface associated with the client, as required by independent claims 1, 6, 7, and 12, and their dependent claims. Applicants respectfully request that the panel allow the claims because they are not anticipated by Deering.

Additionally, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Deering in view of United States Patent No. 5,883,640 to Hsieh et al. (hereafter "Hsieh"). Also, the Examiner maintained his rejection of claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Deering in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0084052 to Peterson (hereafter "Peterson"). These rejections are improper because (1) each and every claim element of claims 3, 4, 9, and 10 are not taught by the combination of the various references and (2) the suggestion or motivation to combine the references as provided by the Examiner is improper.

PAGE 6/9 * RCVD AT 10/3/2005 7:30:29 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:16177422041 * DURATION (mm-ss):09-18

In the Response to the Non-Final Office Action filed by Applicants on March 14, 2005 at page 8, applicants provided a clear and concise explanation as to why Deering in combination with Hsieh or Peterson doesn't teach or suggest the invention as claimed.

Further and with regard to claims 3 and 9, Hsieh fails to cure the deficiency of Deering. Hsieh does not teach or suggest the limitation of a coordinate system corresponding to a region of a display surface associated with the client. Hsieh discusses how to improve graphics performance by caching alphanumeric strings on a local computer. Nowhere does Hsieh discuss a client server network or rending a strip on a display surface that is associated with a client. Therefore, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Hsieh to arrive at the claimed invention. As such, Hsieh does not teach or suggest the limitation of a coordinate system corresponding to a region of a display surface associated with the client.

Accordingly, the combination of Deering and Hsieh does not teach or suggest the limitation of a coordinate system corresponding to a region of a display surface associated with the client, as required by claims 3 and 9. Applicants respectfully request reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3 and 9 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

With regard to claims 4 and 10, Peterson fails to cure the deficiency of Deering. Peterson does not teach or suggest the limitation of a coordinate system corresponding to a region of a display surface associated with the client. Peterson discusses a computerized information retrieval system that enables information to be classified and graded with actual or virtual storage correlated to the system of classification and grading, so that the retrieved data may have a greater likelihood of being quality information. Nowhere does Peterson discuss a client server system or a coordinate system associated with a display surface. Therefore, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Peterson to arrive at the claimed invention. As such, Peterson does not teach or suggest the limitation of a coordinate system corresponding to a region of a display surface associated with the client.

Accordingly, the combination of Deering and Peterson does not teach or suggest the limitation of a coordinate system corresponding to a region of a display surface associated with the client, as required by claims 4 and 10. Applicants respectfully request reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 4 and 10 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

PAGE 7/9 * RCVD AT 10/3/2005 7:30:29 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:16177422041 * DURATION (mm-ss):09-18